UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1994/SR.4
8 March 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE BOARD

First regular session of 1994

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 16 February 1994, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. SERSALE de CERISANO (Argentina)
(Vice-President)

CONTENTS

Organization of the work of the Executive Board (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

In the absence of Mr. Ansari (India),
Mr. Sersale de Cerisano (Argentina),
Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (continued)

Sessions of 1994, briefings and field visits

1. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that the dates proposed by the Bureau for field visits to Viet Nam, the Philippines, the occupied Palestinian territories and Jordan were 25 April to 6 May 1994. There was a possibility of a further visit to two African countries in August 1994. In accordance with the procedure adopted in 1993, all candidates for field visits were to submit their credentials to the Bureau, which would review the requests on the basis of the available space.

2. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that his delegation would be grateful if no visit could be scheduled for the week of 2 to 6 May 1994, as a meeting of newly restored or emerging democracies was to be held during that week in a Central American country, and he doubted whether senior officials of his Government would be available to hold meetings with the Board's delegation.

3. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that it would be difficult to change the dates of the field visits, as meetings were scheduled during each of the weeks leading up to June. He suggested that the weeks allotted for visits to Viet Nam and the Philippines should be switched.

4. Mr. ACHA (Peru) requested clarification concerning two matters. First, his country's Permanent Mission to the United Nations had submitted to the Bureau the names of its candidates for the field visits, in response to the invitation which it had received in 1993 from the Bureau of the Governing Council. He wondered whether it would be necessary for the Mission to submit a new application in view of the Council's transformation into the Executive Board. Secondly, at the previous session, a discussion had been held on the basis of document DP/1993/21 concerning the methodology for the allocation of resources for the sixth programming cycle. The Council, in its decision 93/24, had requested the Administrator to continue consultations on the subject, including at the current session, with a view to submitting a conceptual paper on issues relating to the sixth cycle at the forty-first session. However, if the matter was not to be taken up at the current session, as the agenda seemed to indicate, it would need to be discussed in May, as that was the last opportunity prior to the annual session.

5. The PRESIDENT, replying to the Peruvian representative's first question, said that, once the Bureau had decided on the composition of the field delegation, the secretariat would send requests for further information on the candidates to all the countries concerned. Secondly, the question of following up Council decision 93/24 would be dealt with in the report of the Administrator. A document was in preparation by the secretariat, which would be circulated as DP/1994/20, and the Bureau was also considering the possibility of holding informal consultations on the issue.

6. Mr. DIECKERT (Germany) said that, while field visits were very useful, the results of the current discussion of the future of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) must be taken into account in the design of such visits.

7. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom) said that, for the past 18 months, the Council, now the Board, had been bedevilled by the question under consideration. Scheduling must be left to the Bureau; otherwise, the Board would become involved in micromanagement.

8. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Bureau should hold further consultations.

Rules of procedure

9. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two working papers which were before the members of the Board, namely, the rules of procedure of the Governing Council, and a document entitled "Elements for provisional rules of procedure of the Executive Board of UNDP/UNFPA".

10. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that, in the second paper to which the President had referred, the Bureau had presented a preliminary version of the draft rules of procedure which would be submitted to the Board for consideration and adoption in June. The Council's rules of procedure were not very detailed; at the previous six sessions of the Council, there had never been a need to refer to them.

11. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that the paper was very useful; he noted with appreciation that the source from which each paragraph had been taken was indicated.

12. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand) said it was her understanding that the paper represented an indicative list of issues to be addressed, rather than a preliminary draft.

13. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) confirmed the previous speaker's understanding.

14. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. DIECKERT (Germany), said that, while his delegation had no difficulties with the paper, it would clearly cause problems for other delegations; the question of the venue for the Board's meetings would need to be addressed at the May session.

15. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand) said that the final paragraph of the section entitled "Sessions", which referred to annual sessions being held alternately at United Nations Headquarters and at the United Nations Office at Geneva, should be deleted, in accordance with the decision taken by the Council in 1993 to give further consideration to the matter.

16. Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that he agreed with the representative of New Zealand.

17. Mr. MONROE (United States of America) said that the broad array of views on the issue should be taken into account.

18. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that it would be useful to know whether General Assembly resolution 48/162 stated explicitly that regular sessions of the Board should be held at the headquarters of UNDP/UNFPA as of the date when such premises were rendered possible to accommodate such meetings.

19. Mr. PASHA (Pakistan), supported by Mr. CABEIRO-QUINTANA (Cuba), said that significant deletions had been made in the provisional rules of procedure, as compared to those of the Governing Council, and that they deserved careful consideration. He proposed that the new rules of procedure be discussed at the regular session of the Executive Board in May 1994.

20. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) said that while he supported that proposal, he believed that a general exchange of views regarding the working methods and procedures of the Executive Board at the current session would also be beneficial.

21. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada), supported by Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway), suggested that those items requiring general discussion could be considered at the current session, in particular the issues of sessional bodies and subsidiary organs, languages, records and participation of non-members. Following the general discussion, members could submit written recommendations to the secretariat for discussion during the May 1994 session.

22. Mr. MONROE (United States of America), agreeing with the representative of Canada, said that while some issues were sensitive and required additional consideration in capitals, he hoped that the May session would not be spent dissecting the rules of procedure and proposed that the Committee proceed with a general discussion of some of the difficult issues at its current session.

23. Mr. ROBLES (Observer for Mexico) and Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) supported the proposal of the representative of Canada.

24. Mr. BABA (Observer for Uganda) said that the new Executive Board should define its rules of procedure as soon as possible. He therefore proposed that discussion of the rules of procedure should be postponed until the following day, rather than waiting until the May 1994 session.

25. Mr. YAO Wenlong (China), supporting the views of the representatives of Pakistan and Cuba, suggested that the secretariat organize informal meetings to discuss the provisional rules of procedure prior to the May session.

26. Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom) said that since rules 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 repeated the previous rules word for word, except that "Governing Council" had been replaced by "Executive Board", he proposed that they be discussed only if a member specifically raised them. The other rules pertaining to issues of language and observers should be scrutinized in greater detail.

27. Ms. RIBEIRO-VANDERAUWERA (Belgium) said that members of the Board and observers had had a chance to voice their views on several topics at the previous meeting. She agreed that only those items about which there was some disagreement should be discussed.

28. Mr. PASHA (Pakistan) said that although the rules of procedure were not often invoked, they were important and deserved careful consideration. If the Executive Board wished to postpone consideration of the rules of procedure until the May 1994 session, then any changes in their provisions could be discussed in the regional groups, at the current session. Those issues which representatives wished to discuss with their capitals could be taken up subsequently.

29. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand), Mr. JONG (Observer for the Netherlands), speaking also on behalf of Switzerland, and Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) endorsed the proposal of the representative of Canada with regard to rules 5, 7, 9 and 12.

30. The PRESIDENT said that in order to expedite consideration of the matter at the May session, the secretariat had sought members' initial reactions to the provisional rules of procedure. Endorsing the suggestion of the representative of Uganda, he proposed that the Board resume discussion of the rules of procedure at its meeting on 18 February, which would allow members additional time to review the documents before holding a general discussion.

31. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said that there were three possibilities: the Board could continue its discussion at the current meeting, delay all consideration of the rules of procedure until the meeting on 18 February or leave it to those interested to hold informal discussions.

32. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that the first of those options was not feasible, as most delegations had probably not had sufficient time to read the document. He suggested that the second option of establishing either a small working group or involving the Board as a whole to submit recommendations to the plenary on Friday morning, should be adopted.

33. Mr GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that in the secretariat's paper on elements for provisional rules of procedure, wherever the word "Administrator" appeared, the phrase "and the Executive Director" should be added, as the Executive Board was the governing body of both UNDP and UNFPA.

34. Mr. MONROE (United States of America) said that the rules of procedure per se were not the issue; they parallelled very closely the old rules of the Governing Council and additional sources, as indicated in the secretariat's paper. What was important was how the Board was going to conduct its business in the future. The representative of Canada had identified some issues which the Board would do well to address in the remaining time available, otherwise it might find itself facing the same problem when it took up the matter again the following day.

35. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) said that while his delegation would be interested in hearing preliminary comments from other delegations on the various sections of the secretariat paper, so that when the Board resumed its discussions on Friday, 18 February, it would know how to proceed. It would be desirable to start with the second section II, on the agenda; the Board had already identified the problem in section I, namely, alternating the holding of sessions between Geneva and New York.

36. Mr. RÖHNER (Observer for Switzerland), supported by Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco), suggested that informal consultations should be held, presided over by the President.

37. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Executive Board of
the United Nations
Development Programme
and of the United Nations
Population Fund

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1994/SR.5
8 March 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE BOARD

First regular session of 1994

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 17 February 1994, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. ANSARI (India)

CONTENTS

Presentation by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on the theme "Building a new UNDP: agenda for change"

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

PRESENTATION BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME ON THE THEME "BUILDING A NEW UNDP: AGENDA FOR CHANGE"

1. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)) said that he had spent his first seven months as Administrator listening and learning. He had visited countries the world over and met with representatives of Governments and society at large. During that period, UNDP had undertaken a comprehensive internal and external review of its strengths and weaknesses and had instituted extensive consultations on new directions for its activities. He had established a transition team to review previous studies and the team's report had been the object of intensive in-house discussion. In addition, a Strategic Planning Unit had been established within the Central Evaluation Office to provide strategic guidance and analysis of options relating to the themes and programmes of UNDP. The new combined Evaluation and Strategic Planning Office would report directly to the Administrator.

2. In his consultations with the Programme's development partners, he had had discussions with the Governments of all major donor countries and with the heads of various United Nations agencies. During those discussions, he had elicited the views of his interlocutors on the report of the transition team. Given the importance of building outside support for the Programme's work, he had convened an external advisory panel as part of the consultative process. His objective for the Programme and for associated Funds such as UNIFEM, UNCDF, UNSO, and UNV, was to develop a world-class institution on the existing foundations.

3. A powerful case could be made for change in both the Programme and the Organization as a whole. The end of the cold war, which had reduced polarization and brought about some degree of demilitarization, had enhanced the international community's ability to focus on other problems. Increased democratization and a near-universal commitment to market-driven approaches had been accompanied by technological advances and a communications revolution whose potential to address the world's needs was enormous.

4. At the same time, however, the world continued to be plagued by poverty, fundamental inequities in the distribution of opportunities and resources, a breakdown in various societies, discrimination against women, environmental degradation and a huge gap between potential and reality. In those circumstances, it was more important than ever for development cooperation efforts to succeed and the disparities between the North and the South to be reduced. Although the case for successful international cooperation for development was stronger than ever, actions commensurate with challenges and opportunities were not being undertaken.

5. There could be no doubt that official development assistance (ODA) had improved the quality of life for many people through support for food production, health, transport and communications, family planning and other development activities. At the same time, however, it had frequently reflected cold war ideologies and short-term national defence and geopolitical aims. It was generally recognized that the content of such assistance was often

(Mr. Speth)

inappropriate. Its focus on hardware and reliance on external expertise had introduced distortions into existing structures, created inefficient bureaucracies and unpayable debts and benefited elites and not the people. While the Programme's activities had escaped some of the criticisms levelled against ODA, it had become clear that the "aid" of the past was a poor basis on which to justify the development partnerships needed for the future. New patterns of international cooperation must be forged which placed emphasis on sustainable capacity-building.

6. With the end of the cold war, the United Nations itself was at a stage of transition fraught with pitfalls but also filled with opportunities. The Organization was increasingly being called upon to provide assistance in emergencies, to settle disputes, and to play a greater role in forging international agreements and in monitoring their implementation. Its growing membership rendered the organization of United Nations activities much more complex and there was a pressing need to coordinate and integrate those activities in order to achieve the maximum impact on development. The Organization must be a major force for sustainable human development, global human security and a reformed programme of international development cooperation. For its part, UNDP must change its modus operandi in order to assist the United Nations as a whole to achieve those objectives.

7. The criticisms of the Programme's performance and role in past years could be grouped into three main areas: its weak substantive capacity and limited mailbox functions; its lack of focus and the consequent overstretching of staff and resources, which had added to the difficulty of measuring the long-term impact of technical assistance; and the failure of the United Nations system to accept fully the coordination and central funding role of the Programme. Moreover, the Programme's leadership capacity both at Headquarters and in the field was uneven.

8. Significant changes had also taken place in the flow of financial resources. The share of ODA allocated to multilateral institutions was declining as was the share of multilateral ODA going to the United Nations. Aid was increasingly being diverted to emergency, humanitarian and peace-keeping operations, with less going to long-term development. In addition, there had been a major shift over time in sharing the burden of voluntary contributions to the Programme and the sustainability of the latter's resource base was therefore threatened. The significant decline in core programme expenditures had been accompanied by a broad trend towards earmarked increases as opposed to voluntary core contributions. Indeed, while regular budget financing for the technical cooperation programmes of the specialized agencies had grown by only 10 per cent during the period 1980-1990, financing for extrabudgetary programmes had grown by over 80 per cent. There had also been a major shift in the distribution of resources to the least developed countries (LDCs), which had resulted in IPF resources being spread very thinly among a large number of non-LDCs. It was therefore clear that change was needed if the Programme were to avoid being totally marginalized as a funding agency.

9. The case for change in the Programme was based on the compelling needs of the countries in transition for new patterns of development cooperation. The

(Mr. Speth)

earlier consensus approach had proved inadequate to the current needs of the developing world and a more relevant model was therefore needed. Finally, the full potential of the United Nations and of UNDP to be major forces for global human security and sustainable human development in the developing world must be realized. However, thanks mainly to the decisions of the Governing Council and of the General Assembly, the process of change had already been launched and must now be consolidated and guided in the right direction.

10. Many of the conditions that had led to the consensus approach of the 1970s had changed fundamentally and the Programme had received many new mandates and responsibilities. The process of renewal of UNDP must begin with the real and often desperate needs of programme countries. The Programme, however, should not attempt to be all things to all people and should be guided by certain points of reference.

11. The first point of reference was the legislative mandates of the General Assembly and of the Governing Council. The Council, for example, had mandated the Programme to promote human development and to build and strengthen national capacity in the areas of poverty alleviation and grass-roots participation, environment and natural resource management, management for development, women in development, the transfer and adaptation of technology and technical cooperation among developing countries. For its part, the General Assembly had reaffirmed the role of resident representatives in coordinating United Nations humanitarian assistance and other activities at the country level.

12. International agreements and commitments, often forged under the auspices of the United Nations, were a second point of reference. The international community was building consensus on how to achieve and sustain human development and it was natural for UNDP to play a major role in helping countries to fulfil their commitments under such agreements.

13. A third point of reference was the emerging responsibilities of the United Nations. With its broad mandate in the social and economic fields, its coordination responsibilities for humanitarian and development operations, and its unique network of 131 country offices, the Programme must be seen and used as a major vehicle for the Organization's work around the world. Indeed, if UNDP did not exist, something very similar would have to be invented.

14. Those legislative mandates and international agreements were leading to a new paradigm of development needs in all countries and an emerging vision of development as human-centred, equitable and socially and environmentally sustainable. Not only did sustainable human development generate economic growth, but it also distributed its benefits equitably, regenerated rather than destroyed the environment, empowered rather than marginalized people, and enlarged their choices and opportunities and provided for their participation in decisions affecting them. Sustainable human development was a unifying concept for all development cooperation, and required a new approach.

(Mr. Speth)

15. Country plans and priorities constituted the only viable frame of reference for UNDP support, but given its current voluntary funding base, UNDP would be able to mobilize financial support only if the interests of developing and donor countries overlapped. Its own accumulated capabilities and comparative strengths and assets must, clearly, be part of any thinking about its future. The special strengths and roles of UNDP stemmed from its universality and neutrality as part of the United Nations and the mutual trust which had been built up. Another asset was its 130 country offices and the accumulated knowledge of country conditions, access to Governments, non-governmental organizations and bilateral agencies. The resident coordinator role of the UNDP resident representative was also important, as were its multisectoral, integrated view of development, universal access to expertise and technology, including the important expertise of the specialized agencies, and its ability to offer grant aid.

16. Regarding the mission and operational goals of UNDP, full support should be given to the framework of sustainable human development, which was consistent with the United Nations Charter and legislative mandates. The core mission of UNDP for the future was to assist programme countries in their endeavour to achieve sustainable human development. To achieve that mission, three clear organizational goals could be identified: to strengthen international cooperation for sustainable human development and to serve as a major substantive resource on methods of achieving it; to help the United Nations family become a unified, powerful force for sustainable human development; and to focus the strengths of UNDP and assets in order to make the maximum contribution to sustainable human development in the countries it served. Those goals were set as a direct response to criticisms that UNDP had weak substantive capacity, needed to support United Nations coordination and provide other required services and that its efforts and their impact were diffused. Pursuing those goals would require a rethinking of UNDP operations without increasing the core biennial budget.

17. In achieving the first goal of strengthening international cooperation for sustainable human development, UNDP had a duty to the countries it served to offer development alternatives for national policies and programmes that were responsive to local needs and priorities. It must bring those lessons to the international debate to help build consensus and coalitions for action. UNDP was not in competition with the specialized agencies and did not need to duplicate their expertise, but should devote more effort to intersectoral areas, where the specialized agencies were not strong. Its major contribution to date in that area had been the Human Development Report.

18. The second goal of UNDP was to help the United Nations become a unified, powerful force for sustainable human development. The greatest asset of the United Nations was its moral authority, largely built on real service to real people. Through its operational programmes for humanitarian relief, development, cooperation, and environmental and population programmes, it must be a tangible force for the betterment of peoples' lives and the realization of global human security. It was more important than ever to coordinate programmes

(Mr. Speth)

at the country level, making the United Nations development system an effective force for sustainable human development. UNDP should enable the United Nations system to deliver assistance in the most efficient integrated manner. It must give priority to supporting and strengthening the resident coordinator/resident representative system and General Assembly resolution 47/199. The United Nations must be known as a powerful force for peace, and the biggest contribution it could make to peace was preventive and curative development.

19. As for the third goal - to strengthen and target UNDP programmes for maximum impact on sustainable human development - resources must be concentrated in areas where they could help countries realize their own objectives. In its decision 90/34, the Governing Council had directed UNDP to concentrate on the elimination of poverty, the regeneration of the environment and the advancement of women, and had directed it to deploy means such as capacity-building, development management, grass-roots development, promoting access to technology and finance and technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC) towards those ends. UNDP must emphasize poverty elimination, not alleviation, through the creation of sustainable means of earning a livelihood. Those objectives were complementary and, to differing degrees, were among the priority goals of every programme country and would also receive support from donors.

20. UNDP must feel a profound sense of responsibility and hold itself accountable for a reduction in world poverty, sustaining environmental resources for the future, and elevating the status of women. Lack of progress on those fronts was unacceptable. Although that mandate was daunting, avoiding initiatives that did not engage the strengths of UNDP would result in more focused activities. Over time, UNDP would also be called on to undertake an array of special initiatives for which it could develop expertise and mobilize major additional resources, in such areas as broad human development investment strategies, transfer and adaptation of environmentally sound technology, sustainable food security, anti-desertification action plans, and integrated approaches linking energy, climate and forest goals. Additional non-core financial resources in such areas must not grow at the expense of continued growth in core resources.

21. Just as UNDP should not attempt to pursue all ends, it should not attempt to employ all means. It must become expert at interventions that drew on its assets and strengths, fell within its mandates and could have a major impact on promoting its goals. It must see its relatively modest financial resources as catalytic funding for policy change or as seed money to mobilize larger investment resources.

22. Various decisions of United Nations bodies had provided guidance on the means by which UNDP could achieve its goals. It had been asked to assist in building government capacity in areas including development management, economic reform and democratization, in providing policy advice and substantive expertise and in helping Governments institute long-term development programmes. It had also been asked to mobilize financial resources, promote technology exchange and support technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC). It could also help by building capacity in the non-governmental area, by supporting high-leverage projects needed to validate policy ideas, demonstrate grass-roots

(Mr. Speth)

success or launch major programme initiatives. It had also been asked to participate in forging North-South partnerships, reach agreements and establish shared goals with reciprocal responsibilities. As with the core goals, those methods were overlapping and mutually reinforcing. If they were effectively utilized, they made a powerful package for change.

23. Those signposts for change pointed towards the UNDP of the future. Through its pursuit of the goal of acting as a substantive development resource, UNDP would become a key agent in sustainable human development, thus making a significant contribution to global peace and human security. By pursuing the second goal of service to the United Nations, it would become a major force in the coordination of external development and humanitarian assistance at the country level, while building internal coordination capacity. By pursuing its third goal of strengthening and targeting its programmes, UNDP would be enabled to make a measurable impact on country efforts against poverty and environmental decline and in favour of sustainable human development by building capacity in government and society at large so that people could manage their own development.

24. The challenges before UNDP were some of the gravest mankind had ever faced. The sense of urgency regarding the mission of UNDP must be restored.

25. Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that the Administrator had not addressed the key issue of resource allocation, especially in relation to the sixth cycle. He asked whether UNDP actually had the capacity, especially in human resource terms, to be an intellectual leader in development thinking and to take the lead in all the new areas and new situations at the field level. It would seem that the planning and policy mechanisms would need to be strengthened further in order to reach that goal.

26. He asked whether UNDP would develop sub-goals, plans and strategies in the fight against poverty so as to maximize impact and avoid duplication within the system; what the next steps would be in defining more precisely how the broad objectives would be translated into detailed programmes and strategies for the Board's consideration; and whether there was a timetable for the work that was to be carried out.

27. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that UNDP would have to develop its capacity to make an intellectual contribution and could not do so in all areas. It would need to strengthen the office which produced the Human Development Report so that other documents highlighting important international issues could be put forward for consideration. The Policy Bureau would have to be strengthened so that UNDP would have an up-to-date understanding of the most effective ways of promoting development. UNDP needed an in-house learning capacity and also needed to coordinate its efforts with intellectual resources of universities around the world.

28. UNDP did need sub-goals; he hoped that the initiatives of offering special services to countries with similar problems and needs would enable UNDP to reach the sub-goal stage.

(Mr. Speth)

29. On the next steps to be taken, he hoped that UNDP would be able to assimilate and go beyond the issues and move on to detailed policies and the process of operationalizing the ideas discussed. Further presentations would be made to the Board on that subject.

30. Mr. LEENSTRA (Observer for the Netherlands) said that it was very clear that UNDP had a future role to play. The time had come to work out details and operationalize the general ideas, rather than to continue to consider the role of UNDP in the abstract.

31. UNDP was judged by its field performance; the resource situation was a reflection of the quality of the Programme's work. He asked what the Administration was prepared to do to raise the funds that were needed. He felt that at the next session, UNDP should concentrate on field activities and the organizational changes that were required in countries themselves, as well as the need to streamline UNDP headquarters and reduce red tape.

32. On the question of the diversion of funds to emergency humanitarian aid and peace-keeping operations, his delegation felt that the funds used for those purposes were also development funds and corresponded to the objectives of UNDP; unless those problems were tackled, it would not be possible to think of long-term sustainable development in many countries.

33. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that he would indeed like to move from the abstract discussion to questions of how to incorporate the ideas discussed into country programmes and operations at the field level. He agreed that resources needed to be used to respond to crisis situations around the world; however, as resources were increased for humanitarian emergencies and peace-keeping operations, a corresponding increase must be made in the development commitment.

34. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) said that the Administrator had not provided an analysis of how the three main goals he had outlined would be coordinated. Experience had shown that there were often conflicts between different roles played by UNDP.

35. His delegation strongly agreed with the need for better coordination within the United Nations; he asked how the coordinating role of UNDP could be enhanced. There was a dilemma in that if UNDP had a sharper focus it would become an expert in some fields of development and not others; UNDP needed to be able to coordinate the whole range of development issues.

36. A strong case had been made for UNDP to reorient itself to address new challenges; however, there was a danger of losing the development focus. For example, UNDP activities concerned with the environment must be linked with the core areas of development and the goal of poverty alleviation.

37. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that coordination would be achieved by having a set of shared objectives. There was no conflict between being a substantive development professional and being able to coordinate; those functions could be synergistic. UNDP would try not to duplicate the expertise of other parts of the system but would focus on tackling development problems in an integral manner. A more focused approach was compatible with the objective of ensuring coordination. Some complementarity existed in the humanitarian area since humanitarian efforts had to be coordinated with development objectives. However, there had been cases where relief efforts had actually set back development efforts.

38. Mr. BABA (Observer for Uganda) said that his delegation hoped that UNDP would remain focused on the problems of those most in need and the core problems of poverty, as well as new problems like HIV/AIDS; that it would remain active in the field; and that it would help promote South-South development.

39. In respect of UNDP's targets, he asked whether there was a timetable, either by country or by the problems that were to be tackled.

40. The Administrator had referred to the need for additional resources; he asked how such resources would be obtained given the aid fatigue among the donor community.

41. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that UNDP did not have a systematic time-frame, but it had a general commitment and a sense of what was needed.

42. He was very concerned about the resource situation; in the changing economic situation it would not be possible to build the new development cooperation structure on the basis of the old. The approach would have to be to point out to Governments and people that it was far cheaper and more effective to prevent problems than to react to them after they had arisen. He would try to use his offices as well as forthcoming international conferences to bring that message to donor Governments.

43. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that the concept of sustainable human development needed to be more precisely defined. He hoped that the Administrator would be able to eliminate the negative attitude of donor countries towards providing resources to UNDP and to increase the credibility of the United Nations system with the Bretton Woods institutions. He asked what the role of UNDP was in the framework of national action and whether it was counter-productive to go directly to target groups rather than working through national Governments. He sought clarification about the relationship between UNDP and the Economic and Social Council, since it seemed that UNDP was performing some of the Council's coordinating functions.

44. On the question of coordination at the field level, he asked whether there was a temptation for resident coordinators to become "super-ambassadors" of the United Nations. He further asked whether abstract criteria such as freedom would continue to be included in the Human Development Report, since such criteria could cause problems for some donor countries.

45. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that UNDP counted on a close working relationship with the Bretton Woods institutions; by building on each other's mutual strengths, a high degree of complementarity could be attained between them.

46. On the question of cooperation with other groups, he said that, pursuant to specific agreements, the Programme was working with host Governments to expand cooperation with a broad variety of groups in society; he hoped that, with the blessing of the Governments concerned, UNDP would be able to tap into the expertise of NGOs. Lastly, UNDP had no intention of trying to take on functions that the Economic and Social Council was performing; he hoped that the discussions in the Executive Board could clear the way for the Economic and Social Council to join UNDP in pursuing common objectives.

47. Mr. GORELIK (Russian Federation) said he had been gratified to note that UNDP included among its priorities the question of assistance to countries in political and economic transition and the integration of such countries into the world economy. In that connection, he found the ideas raised by the Administrator very interesting, although their implications remained unclear.

48. His Government favoured a more consistent approach by UNDP to the execution of tasks, preferably by focusing its efforts on a smaller number of projects at the local level. Also, he wished to know what steps UNDP intended to take to shift the emphasis in its programmes away from emergency humanitarian assistance towards long-term development goals. Lastly, he wondered if the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) would not be better equipped than UNDP to implement food security programmes.

49. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said UNDP was currently devoting considerable resources to the problem of how best to support the countries in transition and was likely to continue to do so in the future. On the question of food security, he believed that sustainable food security was one of the most urgent questions currently facing the world. He viewed the role of UNDP in enhancing food security as one of assisting countries to unite key players with a view to building domestic capacity in that area. In that context, he did not believe that UNDP was duplicating the work of FAO or other specialized agencies.

50. Mr. RUGE (Germany) said his Government supported fully the objective of refocusing the attention of UNDP on the human aspects of sustainable development. However, since the concept of sustainable human development encompassed a broad range of activities and projects, he believed more attention should be given to issues of coordination and financing, particularly at the national level. On the question of evaluation, he believed UNDP needed a strong evaluation unit to act as a counterweight to decentralization. When used effectively, the evaluation process could be an asset to programmes and could enable recipient countries and executing agencies to become full participants in the programme planning process.

51. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) agreed that UNDP needed a strong evaluation unit in order to promote a sense of accountability with respect to overall objectives and to assess performance with respect to specific goals. To that end, he had taken steps to incorporate a strategic planning function into the UNDP Central Evaluation Office (CEO); in addition, a new Evaluation and Strategic Planning Office had been established that would report directly to the office of the Administrator.

52. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said she had been impressed by the Administrator's emphasis on accountability. She believed that in the absence of personal commitment, there could be no sense of urgency to act. Moreover, the Administrator had provided a clear analysis of the future course of development cooperation between national Governments and international organizations. In fact, in many cases, the goals of both were quite similar and, for that reason, a greater effort should be made to avoid duplication. She looked forward to seeing the results of the Administrator's meeting with resident representatives so that she could understand more clearly the implications of the new approach for country programmes. For its part, Canada hoped that the recommended changes would be significant.

53. Personnel issues were closely related to many of the problems addressed by the Administrator. It was essential that resident representatives and resident coordinators should be effective and competent professionals. In that connection, she had noted with satisfaction the Administrator's expression of support for the General Assembly resolutions on that question.

54. She had also noted with interest the reference in the Administrator's presentation to the increase in earmarked contributions to UNDP as compared to general contributions. In her view, that shift in resources would force UNDP to finance any new initiatives through reductions in country programmes, which were funded under the regular budget. She wished to know what steps the Administrator was planning to make resources from funds-in-trust and earmarked budgets available for use in country programmes.

55. Mr. MONROE (United States of America) said the views expressed by the Administrator in his presentation would be of considerable interest to his Government. He had noted with particular interest the discussion of synergies to be exploited between the various elements of the United Nations development cooperation system. Moreover, he shared the view of the Administrator regarding the need for creative interaction with the Executive Board.

56. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand) said she had noted with interest the comments of the Administrator concerning accountability. New Zealand considered monitoring and evaluation to be especially critical tools for enhancing the output of development cooperation programmes. Governments were beginning to focus increasing attention on specific results of development cooperation rather than processes. The element of competition had been introduced into the resource allocation process and the achievement of results was being rewarded with additional resources. For that reason, she had appreciated the emphasis in the presentation on goals and strategies as opposed to past achievements. In that

(Ms. Dowsett, New Zealand)

context, she wondered what concrete performance measures the Administrator was intending to implement at UNDP.

57. Mr. JALLOW (Gambia) said that the Administrator's presentation would inspire new confidence in the ability of the international community to overcome obstacles to development and to cement new relationships of development cooperation between developed and developing countries.

58. The roles and responsibilities of UNDP had changed significantly in response to the recent transformation of world politics, in particular, the transition under way in the former "command" economies. The new reality facing UNDP required a more focused approach to the needs of States which had different development requirements and different capacities. In the past, the analysis of those requirements and needs by UNDP had led to certain misunderstandings. In that connection, he wished to know how, according to the Administrator's new scheme, UNDP would accommodate the specific development needs of individual recipient countries.

59. Mr. RAI (Papua New Guinea) wished to know what steps the Administrator was planning to take to encourage technical cooperation among developing countries.

60. Mr. ACHA (Peru) said the Administrator's presentation had provided valuable information concerning the new profile, goals and objectives of UNDP. In that context, Peru believed sustainable human development represented a commitment on the part of developed and developing countries alike, which should be reflected in the approach of the Executive Board to its work.

61. On the question of indices for the measurement of progress in development, he drew attention to the indices used in the Human Development Report and wished to know whether it would be possible to create new indices that would provide greater information than such simple barometers as gross domestic product (GDP) and population. In his view, there should be new categories of analysis for evaluating the effectiveness of development programmes.

62. Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) said that, in the past, one of the problems faced by UNDP had been the spreading of resources too thinly across too many projects. In order for the results of programmes to be noticed by taxpayers in the donor countries, whose support for development cooperation was crucial, a refocusing of efforts was needed. However, given the great needs of so many developing countries in so many different areas and the presence of strong constituencies favouring the status quo, the changes contemplated by the Administrator would not be easy to implement. In addition, he had been pleased to note the Administrator's comments with regard to the mutual advantages to be gained through cooperation with other agencies within the United Nations system and he hoped that cooperation would continue in the future.

63. Ms. AMERASEKARE (Observer for Sri Lanka) joined with previous speakers in praising the scope and substance of the Administrator's presentation.

64. Sri Lanka agreed with the Administrator that, in the long term, emphasis should be given to eradication, and not simply alleviation, of poverty. Also, the Administrator's comments on the question of food security were well taken and perhaps could serve as a framework for programme planning during the sixth programming cycle. However, the broad objectives set out in the presentation should have been broken down into intermediate goals and strategies and immediate goals. Any information which the Administrator could provide with regard to the immediate goals of both UNDP headquarters and programmes in the field would be welcome. In particular, she wished to know what measures the Administrator was contemplating to enhance the capacity of field-level programme administrators. The slow pace of the transition from programme-based to project-based planning and the bureaucratic management style within UNDP were other problems that needed to be addressed. Moreover, inadequate evaluation both at headquarters and in the field and the lack of coordination among United Nations specialized agencies at the field level required immediate attention. She wished to know how the Administrator intended to tackle those problems.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m